

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The claims are 1-7 and 9-11.

Claims 1 and 3-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Inoue et al. (U.S. 5,786,042).

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The rejection states that Inoue et al. ('042) discloses an attachment film (resin black matrix) for an electronic display (liquid crystal display device).

Inoue et al. in fact relates to a resin black matrix for color filters used in liquid crystal display devices (col. 1, lines 6-7).

Generally, a color filter for liquid crystal display consists of a large number of color triplets, each comprising three color pixels (red, green and blue), formed on a transparent substrate. To enhance the contrast, light-shading regions of predetermined width (which are called black matrices because of their black color on the screen) are formed between these pixels (col. 1, lines 11-17).

A black matrix is used to shade a light, not to permeate a light, as explained above.

To the contrary, an attachment film for an electronic display, as presently claimed, is used for adjusting the quantity of transmitted light from a light source as well as the scattering of transmitted light, and possesses the property of light permeation.

Thus, the resin black matrix of Inoue et al. has the property of shading light and the attached film of the present invention has the property of light permeation. Accordingly, the properties of the resin black matrix and the attachment film of the present invention are completely different in terms of structure, function and effect.

The rejection states that Inoue et al. discloses "an acrylic adhesive having a carboxyl group and/or a hydroxyl group (col. 7, line 42+)".

In reply, Inoue et al. discloses a carboxyl group and a hydroxyl group concentration on the surface of carbon black grains. Then to determine concentrations of hydroxyl group and

carboxylic group on the surface of carbon black, XPS or ESCA is used. Inoue et al. does not describe an acrylic adhesive having a carboxyl group and/or a hydroxyl group.

The present invention employs an adhesive layer which contains carbon black having a pH of 4 or less dispersed therein and contains an acrylic adhesive having a carboxyl group and/or a hydroxyl group. An acrylic adhesive having a carboxyl group and/or a hydroxyl group serves to improve the dispersibility of the carbon and especially improves the dispersibility of the carbon having a pH of 4 or less. The improvement in the dispersibility of the carbon black affects the improvement of light permeation as well as improvement in the contrast between black and white.

Inoue et al. does not disclose the above structure and function of the present invention.

The adhesive layer of the present invention is reseparable. The adhesive of Inoue et al. does not exhibit reseparability. Example 1 of Inoue et al. describes how the polyamide precursor after etching was cured at 300°C for 30 minutes to form a lattice black matrix. The same procedure is carried out in other Examples as well. The preceding description of Inoue et al. demonstrates that the adhesive does not exhibit reseparability.

Accordingly, the rejection on Inoue et al. under 35 U.S.C. 102 is untenable.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoue et al. (U.S. 5,786,042) in view of Aoyama et al. (U.S. 6,147,732).

The rejection states "regarding claim 2, Inoue et al. discloses the claimed invention as described above except for an anti-reflection layer formed on the side of the substrate."

In reply, as explained above, Inoue et al. does not disclose the claimed invention and the combination of Inoue et al. and Aoyama does not overcome the deficiencies of Inoue et al.

Claims 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoue et al. (U.S. 5,786,042) in view of Kawazu et al. (U.S. 5,876,854).

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoue et al. (U.S. 5,786,042) in view of Baker et al. (U.S. 5,200,477).

Claims 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoue et al. (U.S. 5,786,042) in view of Urano et al. (U.S. 5,800,952).

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoue et al.

(U.S. 5,786,042) in view of Urano et al. (U.S. 5,800,952) and further in view of Aoyama et al. (U.S. 6,147,732).

These rejections are also respectfully traversed.

It is apparent that the secondary references cannot overcome the above-discussed basic deficiencies of the primary reference (Inoue et al.).

For the foregoing reasons, it is apparent that all rejections on prior art are untenable and should be withdrawn.

No further issues remaining, allowance of this application is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner has any comments or proposals for expediting prosecution, please contact undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Takuma HATTORI et al.

By: Matthew Jacob
Matthew Jacob
Registration No. 25,154
Attorney for Applicants

MJ/da
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
September 5, 2003